

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The amendments to the claims are merely for clarification and do not raise new issues requiring further examination. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's objection. Applicant notes that the direction of contact is in a direction generally normal to the contact surface. As such, contact with an axially extending member would result in radial contact. The Figures do not include any axially extending member near the liner. Therefore, the present drawings do show "the polymeric liner is free from any radial contact with the case." As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously noted, the direction of contact is in a direction generally normal to the contact surface. Contact with an axially extending member would result in radial contact. Since there is no axially extending member near the liner, there can be no radial contact. As such, the drawings do show the polymeric liner free from any radial contact with the case. If there is any contact shown between the case and the liner it would have to be an

axial contact (contact with the radially extending member). Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cather, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,504,067, hereinafter "Cather"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5, 10 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cather in view of Riesing (U.S. Pat. No. 2,804,325). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that independent claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to include "a case having a radial portion generally disposed in a plane, said radial portion having an innermost free end disposed in said plane." Cather does not show or even suggest this feature. In Cather, the radial portion (24) is located between two axial portions (20, 22). The radial portion (24) has no free ends and therefore does not define an innermost free end within the plane of the radial portion.

Applicant further notes Cather's specific reference to a U-shaped shell, "[s]hell 10 comprises a pair of generally cylindrical portions 20 and 22 and a generally radial portion 24, all forming shell 10 into a more or less U-shaped member." (Col. 2, lines 49-51). Even if the Examiner were to consider cylindrical portion (22) part of radial portion (24), the claims still distinguish from Cather. Specifically, cylindrical portion (22) and radial portion (24) are not disposed in a plane, as required by the amended claims.

Applicant further submits that because the radial portion terminates at a free end without any axial portion, the liner is free from any radial contact with the case, but

instead, is only in axial contact therewith. Applicant submits that the claims further distinguish from Cather for this reason, as previously argued. As such, Applicant submits that amended claims 1, 6 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant further notes that claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-20 depend from claims 1, 6 and 11, respectively, and should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (734) 354-5445.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov 3, 2005

By: Ronald Wangerow
Ronald W. Wangerow, Reg. No. 29,597

FREUDENBERG-NOK GENERAL PARTNERSHIP
Legal Department
47690 East Anchor Court
Plymouth, MI 48170-2455
Direct Line: (734) 354-5445
Facsimile: (734) 451-1445

Serial No. 10/081,130

Page 9 of 9